

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDWARD ARNOLD, JR.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:17-cr-042-APG-CWH

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE'S REPORT &  
RECOMMENDATION ON MOTION TO  
SUPPRESS**

(ECF Nos. 38, 49)

Defendant Edward Arnold, Jr. filed a motion to suppress statements he made to law enforcement officers. ECF No. 38. Magistrate Judge Hoffman entered his Report & Recommendation that the motion to suppress be denied as moot. ECF No. 49. No objection has been filed to that Report and Recommendation. Thus, I am not required to conduct "any review at all ... of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). The Ninth Circuit has confirmed that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objection has been filed. *See United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) ("[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise."); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D.Ariz. 2003) (Based on *Thomas* and *Reyna-Tapia*, "district courts are not required to conduct any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Because there is no objection to Judge Hoffman's recommendation, I accept his recommendation without review.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Hoffman's Report & Recommendation (ECF No. 49) is accepted. Mr. Arnold's motion to suppress (ECF No. 38) is denied.

Dated: July 13, 2017.

  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE